

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **27 July 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-34. Claims 1, 9, and 17 were rejected based on 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Yokoyama (USPN 7,006,836 hereinafter “Yokoyama”).

Restriction requirement

Restriction was required to one of the following species of the claimed invention:

Species 1: Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-24

Species 2: Claims 25-33

Species 3: Claim 34

Applicant confirms the oral election of Species 1 without traverse, made on May 25, 2007. Claims 25-34 have been canceled without prejudice.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 9, and 17 are rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. The Examiner notes that it is unclear as to where the resource record is being retrieved from. Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, and 17 to clarify that the resource record **is retrieved from the local cache** at the client. This finds support in paragraphs [0027] and [0031] of the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17 and 19-24 were rejected as being anticipated by Yokoyama. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant points out that the

system of Yokoyama is limited to periodically detecting the existence of proximal devices, maintaining a list of services information about the detected devices, and publicizing this list of service information for the detected devices, thus enabling other devices that receive this publicized information to connect to any of the detected devices, as needed (see abstract, Fig 3, and line 43, column 4 – line 60, column 5, as well as column 7, lines 24-60 of Yokoyama).

In contrast, embodiments of the present invention are directed specifically towards the maintenance of the **most relevant information** regarding available services on the network in a computer system, ensuring that **stale information is deleted appropriately**. Thus, the embodiments of the present invention maintain resource records in a local cache, where these resource records are related to the services of available devices in the network, and **accelerate the expiration of these local resource records in the local cache** (see paragraph [0002] of the specification). Thus, if an attempt to establish communication with a particular service is not successful, then it is determined that the resource record corresponding to this particular service is no longer valid, and is stale. This determination is then **used to delete the resource record from its local cache**. This finds support in paragraphs [0029]-[0031] and FIG. 3, step 324 and FIG. 4, step 410 of the instant application.

This is beneficial because this invalidation of resource records of non-responding services ensures that the **local cache maintains only that information that is consistent with those devices that are available** and providing the services at a given time, or in response to a particular query. Resource records corresponding to devices that may be offline are invalidated, ensuring that no bandwidth and CPU is wasted in attempting to establish any communication with them

There is nothing, either explicit or implicit, in the system of Yokoyama that discloses maintaining the most current list of service information by deleting

stale information from the maintained list of service information for previously detected devices. It is not possible to use the system of Yokoyama to explicitly delete entries regarding stored service information of previously detected devices in response to an absence of response from the previously detected devices.

Accordingly Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to clarify that the present invention teaches invalidating resource records for non-responding devices by deleting their corresponding resource records from the local cache. These amendments are supported in paragraph [0029]-[0031] and FIGS 3 and 4 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-8 which depend upon claim 1, claims 11-16, which depend upon claim 9, and claims 19-24, which depend upon claim 17, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony P. Jones/
Anthony P. Jones
Registration No. 59,521

Date: 19 October 2007

Anthony P. Jones
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1666
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: tony@parklegal.com